



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,953	01/29/2004	Nicholas Paul MacMillan	0119/0032	2324

21395 7590 01/10/2008
LOUIS WOO
LAW OFFICE OF LOUIS WOO
717 NORTH FAYETTE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

HALL, DEANNA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3767

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/765,953	Applicant(s) MACMILLAN ET AL. CT	
	Examiner Deanna K. Hall	Art Unit 3767	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 6-11, 16-18 and 23-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 6-11, 16-18, 23-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>October 17, 2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgments

1. This office action is in response to the reply filed on October 17, 2007.
2. In the reply, the applicant amended claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 16-18; cancelled claims 1, 5, 12-15, 19-22; and added new claims 23-26. Claims 2-4, 6-11, 16-18 and 23-26 are pending in the application.
3. Applicant's cancellation of claim 1 obviates the 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 1.
4. Acknowledgment is made of the newly compliant declaration submitted on October 17, 2007.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on October 17, 2007 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97(b). Accordingly, the IDS is being considered by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 23-26, 2-4, 6-8, 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hanson (US 5,919,174). Hanson discloses a valve comprising:

A housing defining a first bore 17 and a second bore 25; a valve member having a sealing surface 49 and being slidable in alignment with the first bore from a first position to allow fluid flow and to a second position to block fluid flow between the bores C4 L24-37. Said valve member includes a rod-shaped member 45 which supports a cylindrical sleeve of resilient material 37, 38 which provides a sealing surface with a bore 39, 40 in said housing.

Said valve includes a rotatable locking member 15 operable to prevent movement of said valve member C4 L38-48. The locking member is mounted on said housing and includes a surface formation (projections) 57 movable into and out of alignment with the valve member so as to prevent or enable movement of the valve member C4 L38-46.

A helical spring 31 arranged to urge the valve member to a second position C4 L24-28.

The valve member engages a tapered sealing formation 53 in the housing in the second position.

Second bore 25 is inclined at an angle relative to the first bore; substantially 45 degrees C4 L11-15.

The housing has two walls and the locking member includes two projections that form a continuation of the two walls when the locking member is in a position to enable movement of the valve member, See Figs. 2-3.

The locking member 15 displaces the valve member by a short distance towards a sealing formation 37, 38 when the locking member is moved to its locked position C4 L24-28.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Decloux et al. (US 5,320,328) ("Decloux").**

Hanson shows as discussed above. Hanson does not directly show a plate member arranged for manual engagement and slidably located in a channel extending along an outer surface of the housing. Decloux, in the analogous art, teaches a plate member 34 slidably located in a channel 24 on the outer surface of the housing. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Hanson with the plate member and external channel as taught by Decloux for another way to manually actuate the valve.

10. **Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Decloux further in view of Steigerwald (US 3,828,982).**

The combination of Hanson and Decloux shows as described above.

Hanson/Decloux does not directly show walls protecting the plate member.

Steigerwald, in the analogous art, teaches a safety actuator with walls surrounding the actuator, see Fig. 3. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Hanson/Decloux with the walls as taught by Steigerwald for preventing inadvertent contact with the actuator when the valve is gripped.

11. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson.

Hanson discloses the claimed invention except for the housing being made of transparent material. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the housing of transparent material since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 227 F.2d 197, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., that the cylindrical sleeve need be slidable in alignment with a first bore) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Thus, it is enough that cylindrical sleeve 37 and 38 is supported by a rod-shaped member 45 and provides a sealing surface.

13. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the inclusion of a separate rotatable lock) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Further, the examiner fails to appreciate a distinction between the rotatable and alignable projections of the cap 15 of Hanson and the rotatable cap 71 with alignable projections 76 of this application. Both when aligned allow for either the locking or unlocking of the valve element.

14. With respect to applicant's argument against combining the Decloux reference with Hanson, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking the references individually where the rejection is based on a combination of references, see MPEP 2145. Decloux is being used only to show and modify into Hanson a slidable plate-like actuator.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deanna K. Hall whose telephone number is 571-272-2819. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Sirmons can be reached on 571-272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3767

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Deanna K. Hall
Examiner
AU 3767

dkh

KEVIN C. SIRMONS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Kevin C. Sirmons".